



# **Consultation & Coordination Update**

---

## History of Community Participation

There are many different public agencies, local governments, non-profit organizations and individual citizens who have an interest in this plan. Reaching out to the community for their ideas and expertise and listening to their concerns is an important step in the GMP planning effort. A combination of formal public forums as well as phone conversations, individual meetings, electronic mail, and letters have all contributed important input into the development of this Final GMP/AEIS.

### Former GMP Process

A Notice of Intent to prepare an EIS was published in the Federal Register on April 1, 1997. From 1997-2000, the park and the Northeast Regional Office were engaged in the first GMP planning process. An internal draft document was produced that focused on minor boundary adjustments to protect existing park resources, expanding the interpretive themes, and developing new facilities. This document was never officially released to the public. As part of the NPS internal review process, it was determined that the park should pursue a boundary expansion in order to protect nationally significant battlefields associated with the Petersburg Campaign. The GMP planning process was redirected and new efforts resulted in scoping and conceptual alternative meetings with the public, consultations with the state and federal agencies and elected officials and the development of this draft GMP/EIS.

### Landowner Meetings

Two open house meetings were held in Dinwiddie County in May 2001 to inform landowners about the GMP process and potential boundary expansion. The park sent 200 letters to landowners whose properties were located on or adjacent to the nationally significant battlefields considered for boundary expansion. During the meetings, residents were first presented with information about the historic events of the Petersburg Campaign and the need for conservation and interpretation. Landowners were invited to sit down with the park's historian to review the location of their property and discuss if they were interested in battlefield conservation on their land and if they would like assistance. Additionally, residents were provided with information about all those who are involved in conservation and interpretation in Dinwiddie County. Finally, landowners were given information about the GMP process, Dinwiddie County's Comprehensive Planning process and the proposed County Battlefield Trails planning effort. Twelve landowners attended and participated in the meetings.

---

## Scoping: Public Workshops

Four scoping workshops were held in May 2001 in Dinwiddie County, Fort Lee (Prince George County) Hopewell, and Petersburg. The park sent over 700 letters to residents and agencies and distributed press releases to Petersburg and Richmond area papers. At the workshops, community members heard a brief presentation on the continuation of the park's GMP process. Participants were then involved in a variety of small and large group exercises to gather ideas and issues on visitor use, interpretation, resource protection and partnerships. Comment sheets were also distributed to participants who wanted to capture more extensive thoughts. More than 140 community members and agency staff participated at the workshops.

A summary of the comments received at the workshops was posted on the park's website in June 2001. The summary reflected the thoughts of many participants and was not edited, appearing as they were originally recorded. Following the workshops, the park superintendent and other staff met with locality representatives from cities of Hopewell and Petersburg and Dinwiddie County to discuss their ideas, concerns and potential partnerships. The results of these meetings helped the planning team to determine the key issues for the GMP and develop different options for future park management.

## Conceptual Alternatives Public Workshops

In March 2002, the park sent over 800 letters to residents and agencies and distributed press releases to Petersburg and Richmond area papers in April 2002 inviting the community to participate in conceptual alternatives workshops for the GMP. Recommendations

from the draft lands assessment plus an explanation of the philosophy for each of the four alternatives was presented at four meetings in Dinwiddie County, Fort Lee, Hopewell and Petersburg in May 2002. A newsletter detailing the key issues, alternatives and planning process was distributed at the meeting, by mail to 800 residents and posted on the park's website. Participants at the meetings were asked for comments on what they liked or disliked about each of the four alternatives. Comment sheets were provided again for more in-depth thoughts. Over 50 residents and agency staff attended the four workshops.

The workshop participants' comments were posted on park's website in July 2002. The GMP planning team collected hundreds of ideas and concerns that were taken into consideration in the development of the draft GMP/EIS.

## Briefings to Elected Officials

Throughout this GMP planning effort, the park superintendent and other staff in conjunction with local elected officials, have met with Congressman Randy Forbes, Senator George Allen and Senator John Warner. During these visits, information about the proposed boundary expansion, community support, conceptual alternatives and future park development was presented and discussed. These members of Congress and their staff provided ideas, suggestions and support for the continuation of the GMP process.

## Review Process for the Draft GMP/EIS

In June 2004, Petersburg NB released the Draft General Management Plan/ Environmental Impact Statement. A notice of availability was published in the Federal Register by the U.S.

---

Environmental Protection Agency on June 3, 2004 and the draft document was mailed out to the public during the first week in June. The park distributed 325 copies of the draft plan in hard copy and 1000 compact disks through an initial mailing, at public meetings and upon request. The full draft was available on the park's website and public reading copies were made available at area libraries. The document's availability and the schedule of public meetings were announced through local media.

Public review occurred from June 3 to August 6, 2004. Eight public meetings were held and attended by 170 people in Dinwiddie, Hopewell, Petersburg and Prince George. During the review period, the NPS received 45 comment letters and 925 email messages (905 form letters generated by National Park and Conservation Association members. Comments from all these sources were considered by NPS and informed the preparation of the final EIS. A detailed list of the recipients begins on page 78.

---

# Agency Consultation

## Cultural Resources

Potential impacts on the park's cultural resources will be addressed under the provisions for assessing effects outlined in 36 CFR Part 800, regulations issued by the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) implementing section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended (NHPA; 16 USC 470 et seq.) Under the "Criteria of Effect" (36 CFR Part 800.9(a)), federal undertakings are considered to have an effect when they alter the character, integrity, use of cultural resource, or the qualities that qualify a property for listing in the National Register of Historic Places.

The NPS will consult with the Virginia State Historic Preservation Officers (SHPO) and the ACHP to ensure that NPS operations, management and administration provide for the site's cultural resources in accordance with the intent of NPS policies and with sections 106, 110, and 111 of the NHPA, as stated in the 1995 programmatic agreement (PA) among the NPS, the ACHP and the National Conference of State Historic Preservation Officers. Under section V.A. of the programmatic agreement, all undertakings that are not considered programmatic exclusions would be reviewed in accordance with 36 CFR Part 800.

Internally, the NPS will complete an "Assessment of Actions Having an Effect on Cultural Resources" (XXX form) prior to implementation of any proposed action. The form would document any projected effects and outline actions proposed to mitigate any effects. All implementing actions for cultural resources will be reviewed using the XXX form and reviewed by the park's team of cultural resource advisors as specified in the 1995 PA, as amended.

Before any ground-disturbing action by the NPS, the park's archeologist will determine the need for archeological inventory or testing. Any such studies will be carried out and evaluated for effect before construction, in consultation with the state historic preservation officer, and the ACHP.

Staff from the Virginia Department of Historic Resources participated in the May 2001 scoping meetings and the May 2002 conceptual alternatives workshops. The park superintendent and staff briefed the State Historic Preservation Officer in June 2002 about the GMP process, expansion of interpretive themes and the likely impact of potential future development on historic resources. The SHPO provided favorable comments on the conceptual alternatives in a letter dated June 24, 2002.

---

## Natural Resources

The NPS has worked through informal consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and the Virginia Department Game and Inland Fisheries (VDGIF) concerning endangered and threatened species and critical habitat. No action under the currently proposed alternatives will cause significant adverse effects on endangered or threatened species. VDGIF is a consulting agency under the U.S.

permits from the states or other federal agencies will be obtained prior to action.

In summer 2002, the park requested that the USFWS review the conceptual alternatives and other development actions proposed in the GMP. In a letter dated August 15, 2002 the USFWS stated that they believed that the selection of any of the conceptual alternatives is not likely to adversely affect federally listed species.



*Bonaccord House at City Point.*

Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (48 Stat. 401, as amended; 16 U.S.C. 661 et seq.), providing environmental analysis of projects or permit applications coordinated with the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality and other state and federal agencies.

During the NEPA compliance process, consultation with the appropriate agencies will ensure compliance with all state air and water quality standards. Any actions in floodplains or wetlands in the park will comply with Executive Orders 11988 and 11990 (floodplain management and wetlands protection). Any necessary approvals or

As individual projects are implemented from the GMP, and where environmental assessments are necessary, a determination will be made concerning the environmental consequences of the proposed action. If no significant adverse affects are identified, a finding of no significant impact will be prepared and appended to the GMP. This finding will conclude the compliance process for the National Environmental Policy Act for the involved actions.

Table 8 contains a partial listing of laws, regulations and policies that pertain to the planning process.

---

# List of Preparers

## National Park Service

### Northeast Regional Office

Marie Rust, *Regional Director*

Robert W. McIntosh, *Associate Regional Director for Planning and Partnerships*

Terrence D. Moore, *Chief of Park Planning and Special Studies*

Helen Mahan, *Community Planner and Project Leader*

Christine Gobrial, *Community Planner*

Peter Iris-William, *Park Planner*

Deirdre Gibson, *Park Planning Program Manager (former)*

## Petersburg National Battlefield

Bob Kirby, *Superintendent*

Chris Calkins, *Chief of Interpretation & Visitor Services*

Jerry Helton, *Chief of Maintenance*

Ike Kelley, *Chief Ranger*

Dave Shockley, *Chief of Resources Management*

James Blankenship, *Historian*

Tim Blumenschine, *Natural Resource Management Specialist*

Tracy Chernault, *Interpretive Specialist*

Richard Easterbrook, *GIS Specialist*

Robin Synder, *Education Specialist*

Grant Gates, *Interpretive Specialist*

## Harper's Ferry Center

Tom Tankersley, *Interpretive Planner*

## Consultants

### EA Engineering, Science, and Technology, Inc.

Christine Papageorgis, PhD, *Project Manager*

Mary Alice Koenek, *Natural Resources*

Suzanne Boltz, *Social & Economic Resources*

Dan Raley, *Air Quality and Energy*

---

# List of Recipients

## State and Federal Elected Officials

Senator John W. Warner (VA)  
Senator George Allen (VA)  
Congressman Randy Forbes (4th District)  
State Representative Riley E. Ingram (62nd District)  
State Representative Fenton L. Bland, Jr. (63rd District)  
State Representative J. Paul Councill, Jr. (75th District)

## Non-Governmental Organizations

Chesapeake Bay Foundation, Inc.  
Civil War Preservation Trust  
Civil War Round Table Associates  
Eastern National  
George Wright Society  
The Izaak Walton League  
Historic Petersburg Foundation, Inc.  
Land Trust Alliance, Inc.  
National Park and Conservation Association  
National Park Foundation  
National Trust for Historic Preservation  
Pamplin Historical Park  
Richmond Civil War Round Table  
Rincon Institute  
Siege Museum  
Sons of Confederate Veterans  
Sons of Union Veterans of the Civil War  
The Conservation Fund  
Virginia Council On Indians  
Weston Manor, Inc.

## Local Elected Officials

City of Colonial Heights Board of Supervisors  
City of Hopewell City Council  
City of Hopewell Mayor and Vice-Mayor  
City of Petersburg City Council  
City of Petersburg Mayor  
Dinwiddie County Board of Supervisors  
Prince George County Board of Supervisors

## Local Governments

Chesterfield County Planning Department  
City of Colonial Heights Office of the City Administrator  
City of Colonial Heights Historical Society  
City of Hopewell Chamber of Commerce  
City of Hopewell Office of the City Manager  
City of Petersburg Chamber of Commerce  
City of Petersburg Office of the City Manager  
City of Petersburg Planning Department  
Crater Planning District Commission  
Dinwiddie County Office of the County Administrator  
Dinwiddie County Planning Department  
Dinwiddie County Recreation Department  
Prince George County Office of the County Administrator

## State Agencies

Office of the Governor, Commonwealth of Virginia  
Virginia Council on Indians  
Virginia Department of Conservation and Recreation  
Virginia Department of Economic Development  
Virginia Department of Game and Inland Fisheries  
Virginia Department of Historic Resources  
Virginia Department of Transportation  
Office of the Provost, Virginia Military Institute  
Office of the Provost, Virginia State University

## Federal Agencies

Advisory Council on Historic Preservation  
American Battlefield Protection Program  
Appomattox Court House National Historical Park  
Chesapeake Bay Partnership  
Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania National Military Park  
Gettysburg National Military Park  
Quartermaster Museum- Fort Lee  
Richmond National Battlefield Park  
U.S. Army Combined Support Command and Fort Lee  
U.S. Department of Agriculture, Extension Service  
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency  
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service